



*John T. Aubberger  
Supervisor*

# **TOWN OF GREECE**

## **PLANNING BOARD MINUTES**

**JULY 21, 2010**

**THE MEETING BEGAN AT 7:00 P.M.**

### **PRESENT**

Alvin I. Fisher, Jr., Chairman  
Alfred S. Ancello  
Christine R. Burke  
Brian E. Marianetti  
William E. Selke  
Michael H. Sofia  
Christopher A. Schiano, Deputy Town Attorney  
Scott R. Copey, Clerk of the Planning Board  
John Gauthier, P.E., Associate Engineer  
Linda R. Lamb, Planning Board Secretary

### **ABSENT**

Grace L. Plouffe

### **ADDITIONS, DELETIONS AND CONTINUANCES TO THE AGENDA**

### **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES  
JULY 21, 2010

**PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**Old Business**

None

**New Business**

**1. Applicant: Paul Wilson**

Location: 1251 Maiden Lane

Request: Minor subdivision approval for the Wilson subdivision, consisting of 2 lots (existing house to remain on Lot 1; new Lot 2 for development of single-family residence) on approximately 0.97 acres

Zoning District: R1-12 (Single-Family Residential)

Mon. Co. Tax No.: 074.08-1-13

**The following is a synopsis of the discussion pertaining to the above-referenced request:**

John Clarke of DDS Engineers presented the application

Mr. Clarke: Mr. Wilson has options on a .97 acre parcel located at 1251 Maiden Lane. The parcel has an existing single family house with public utilities. Mr. Wilson would like to subdivide this property into two lots. Lot 1 would be approximately 0.6 acres with the existing home and Lot 2 approximately 0.37 acres with a new single-family residence to be constructed with public utilities. Storm water drainage for the property runs south to an existing pond; we propose to maintain those drainage patterns. We have received comments from the Town and County. We have yet to receive comments from the Monroe County Water Authority (MCWA) or the Monroe County Department of Public Health (MCDOH); we don't anticipate anything significant from them.

Mr. Copey: As indicated by Mr. Clarke, the plans have been reviewed by the Monroe County Development Review Committee (MCDRC), with little comment. The Greece Environmental Board also reviewed the plans and noted that the site was once a farm and questioned whether soil testing was necessary. It has been verified that the house is on sanitary sewer; that will be shown on final drawings. Town staff comments were minimal and provided a street address of 1261 Maiden Lane for the new property.

Mr. Gauthier: Did you take exception to any of the comments we provided?

Mr. Clarke: One comment related to the desire to have drainage run along the southern property line behind proposed Lot 1 to the NYS Route 390 right-of-way; in doing that, you buck grade. Everything runs to the south. More important, you would disturb the existing vegetation.

Mr. Gauthier: Do you have a drainage easement to get drainage to the property to the south?

Mr. Clarke: We currently have no drainage easements. That is where the drainage currently goes.

Mr. Gauthier: Once Lot 2 is developed, we generally would require you to provide storm water management to reduce impact to the neighboring property. This would be an

## PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

JULY 21, 2010

increased burden on the neighboring property. That is the reason for the comment; however, I believe that we can work it out.

Gina DiBella, Chairperson, Town of Greece Historic Preservation Commission:

In the mid-1990s the Town of Greece conducted a survey of historically and architecturally significant properties in the town. From that survey came a list of 101 sites. Three or four times that many properties actually qualify to be in such an inventory today, but at the time, the survey was limited by funding.

The Historic Preservation Commission uses that survey as a starting point when looking at historic properties that might be impacted by upcoming development. A wealth of information is contained within each building/structure inventory form.

The property at 1251 Maiden Lane is one of those properties. According to the wording in the agenda, the owner/developer is planning to retain the historic house. I hope that is correct. However, I'd like to make you aware of what makes this property significant.

According to Charles Wendt, the owner at the time of the survey, the house was built around 1889 for Leo TerHaar. It was originally part of a 54-acre farm that extended west to Fetzner Road and east to where NY 390 is now located.

Charles Wendt's grandfather, also named Charles, purchased the farm in 1908 and it remained in the Wendt family for more than 85 years. On that land were a number of outbuildings including barns, sheds and a farm stand on Fetzner Road. At the time of the survey, 17.4 acres of the farm remained. Today it appears that amount has been reduced to less than one acre. Apartments and a plaza now occupy the once-farmland.

The house is architecturally significant in the Town of Greece as an intact example of a late-nineteenth-century vernacular farm house. It retains a high degree of integrity of design, materials, and craftsmanship. Of special note is the front porch with its Eastlake-inspired turned posts and decorative brackets. Other features worth noting are the hooded side entrance with brackets on the east elevation and a stone retaining wall of coursed ashlar along the front of the property line.

From a recent photo that was sent to me, it appears that the house is sided with its original wood clapboard siding and that most of the original windows remain.

The Historic Preservation Commission hopes that the owner indeed will retain this house in the minor subdivision, as well as all of the original features mentioned above.

Mr. Selke: I've looked at the site and it doesn't appear that anyone is living there. Are you aware that you have windows open in the rear of the house? There seems to be some work that needs to be done. What bothers me the most is the concrete barn pad with piping coming out of it. It looks like a bunker to me. I'm concerned about people getting into this vacant site.

Paul Wilson: I don't own the house now. I realize the house needs some work. I haven't looked at the pad you are referring to, but it appears as though it will have to be removed. The garage will have to be fixed. I will contact the current owners and have them go over

## PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

JULY 21, 2010

to the property to check things out tomorrow.

Mr. Selke: I have no problem with the subdivision of the property but wanted to make you aware of what you have there currently. Is the curb cut a typical, normal driveway? Will you be doing any repairs to it? It is on a bit of a slope.

Mr. Sofia: What is going to happen to the existing driveway? It looks like it loops around and goes to the neighbors.

Mr. Wilson: It doesn't really. It's more of a foot path. We are proposing to take that out.

### **Motion by Mr. Selke , seconded by Ms. Burke:**

WHEREAS, Paul Wilson (the "Applicant") has submitted a proposal to the Town of Greece Planning Board (the "Planning Board") for approval of a minor subdivision, as more fully described in the minutes of this public meeting (the "Proposal"), relative to property located 1251 Maiden Lane (the "Premises"); and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board makes the following findings:

1. Upon review of the Proposal, the Planning Board determined that the Proposal is subject to the State Environmental Quality Review Act (New York State Environmental Conservation Law, Article 8) and its implementing regulations (6 NYCRR Part 617 *et seq.*, the "SEQRA Regulations") (collectively, "SEQRA"), and that the Proposal constitutes an Unlisted action under SEQRA.
2. The Planning Board has considered the Proposal at a public meeting (the "Meeting") in the Greece Town Hall, 1 Vince Tofany Boulevard, at which time all persons and organizations in interest were heard.
3. Documentary, testimonial, and other evidence were presented at the Meeting relative to the Proposal for the Planning Board's consideration.
4. The Planning Board carefully has considered an Environmental Assessment Form and supplementary information prepared by the Applicant and the Applicant's representatives, including but not limited to supplemental maps, drawings, descriptions, analyses, reports, and reviews (collectively, the "Environmental Analysis").
5. The Planning Board carefully has considered additional information and comments that resulted from telephone conversations, meetings, or written correspondence from or with the Applicant and the Applicant's representatives.
6. The Planning Board carefully has considered information, recommendations, and comments that resulted from telephone conversations, meetings, or written correspondence from or with various involved and interested agencies, including but not limited to the Monroe County Department of Planning and Development, the Monroe County Department of Environmental Services, the Town of Greece Environmental Board, and the Town's own staff.
7. The Planning Board carefully has considered information, recommendations, and comments that resulted from telephone conversations, meetings, or written correspondence from or with nearby property owners, and all other comments submitted to the Planning Board as of this date.
8. The Environmental Analysis examined the relevant issues associated with the Proposal.
9. The Planning Board has met the procedural and substantive requirements of SEQRA.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

JULY 21, 2010

10. The Planning Board carefully has considered each and every criterion for determining the potential significance of the Proposal upon the environment, as set forth in SEQRA.
11. The Planning Board carefully has considered (that is, has taken the required "hard look" at) the Proposal and the relevant environmental impacts, facts, and conclusions disclosed in the Environmental Analysis.
12. The Planning Board concurs with the information and conclusions contained in the Environmental Analysis.
13. The Planning Board has made a careful, independent review of the Proposal and the Planning Board's determination is rational and supported by substantial evidence, as set forth herein.
14. To the maximum extent practicable, potential adverse environmental effects revealed in the environmental review process will be minimized or avoided by the incorporation of mitigation measures that were identified as practicable.

NOW, THEREFORE, be it

RESOLVED that, pursuant to SEQRA, based on the aforementioned information, documentation, testimony, and findings, and after examining the relevant issues, the Planning Board's own initial concerns, and all relevant issues raised and recommendations offered by involved and interested agencies and the Town's own staff, the Planning Board determines that the Proposal will not have a significant adverse impact on the environment, which constitutes a negative declaration.

<b>VOTE:</b>	<b>Ancello</b>	<b>- yes</b>	<b>Burke</b>	<b>- yes</b>
	<b>Marianetti</b>	<b>- yes</b>	<b>Plouffe</b>	<b>- absent</b>
	<b>Selke</b>	<b>- yes</b>	<b>Sofia</b>	<b>- yes</b>
			<b>Fisher</b>	<b>- yes</b>

**MOTION CARRIED**  
**SEQRA DETERMINATION**  
**NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

---

**Mr. Selke then made the following motion, seconded by Ms. Burke, to approve the Proposal, subject to the following conditions:**

1. The Applicant shall develop the Premises in conformity with all details of the Proposal as presented in the written descriptions and site development plans, as orally presented to the Planning Board, and as set forth herein. In the event of any conflict among the oral or written descriptions of the proposal, the site development plans of the proposal, or the requirements or restrictions of this resolution, the Applicant agrees that the Planning Board shall determine the resolution of such dispute.
2. A dated signature of the owner/developer shall be added to the plat.
3. Any Town of Greece approval or permit for these premises does not relieve the applicant, developer, or owner of the premises from obtaining all other town, county, state, or federal government approvals or permits that are required for the premises. A note that indicates this requirement shall be added to the plat.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

JULY 21, 2010

4. The Town's *2001 Community Master Plan Update* (Clough, Harbour & Associates, September 2001) contains current and projected population growth; an inventory and analysis of public, private, and semi-private recreation facilities, both active and passive; and recommendations for future actions. Based on this document, the Planning Board finds that the Town currently needs, or will need, additional park and recreation space in the vicinity of the Proposal. The Planning Board further finds that development of this subdivision will contribute to the demand for additional park and recreation space, and that this subdivision provides no suitable park or recreation land to address such current or future need. Therefore, pursuant to New York State Town Law, Section 277, payment of the Town's recreation fee shall be required for each building lot in this subdivision, payable to the Town upon the issuance of the original building permit for each house.
5. No building permits shall be issued for any of the lots in this subdivision unless and until this final plat has been recorded in the Office of the Monroe County Clerk. The Liber and Page at which this final plat is recorded in the Office of the Monroe County Clerk shall be indicated on the approved, signed copies of this final plat that are submitted to the Town. A note that indicates this requirement shall be added to the plat.
6. The location of all utilities serving the existing home shall be identified on the plan.
7. The Liber and Page of all easements shall be noted on the plans.
8. No building permits shall be issued for any of the lots in this subdivision unless and until a digital copy of the plans has been submitted. All sheets in the drawing set, with all necessary signatures and the Liber and Page at which this final plat is recorded in the Office of the Monroe County Clerk, shall be provided in Tagged Image File (".TIF") format at a minimum resolution of 400 dpi.
9. Subject to approval by the Town's Chief Engineer and Commissioner of Public Works.
10. Wherever this resolution refers to a specific applicant, developer, operator, or property owner, it shall be construed to include successors and assigns.
11. Wherever this resolution refers to a specific public official or agency, it shall be construed to include successors and assigns.
12. Wherever this resolution refers to a specific law, ordinance, code, rule, or regulation, it shall be construed to include any succeeding or superseding authority.

**VOTE:**

**Ancello** - yes  
**Marianetti** - yes  
**Selke** - yes

**Burke** - yes  
**Plouffe** - absent  
**Sofia** - yes  
**Fisher** - yes

**MOTION CARRIED**  
**APPLICATION APPROVED**  
**WITH CONDITIONS**

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES  
JULY 21, 2010

**SITE PLANS**

**Old Business**

**1. Applicant: 1877 Ridge Road LLC**

Location: 1877 - 1899 West Ridge Road

Request: Site plan approval for a proposed one-story restaurant (5,695+/- square feet), with related parking, utilities, grading, and landscaping on approximately 4.92 acres

Zoning District: BG (General Business)

Mon. Co. Tax No.: 074.20-1-1 and -2

**The following is a synopsis of the discussion pertaining to the above-referenced request:**

Linda Nunn representing Rare Hospitality International, presented the application.

Ms. Nunn: I have brought material samples for the Board to review. We have been before you at the concept plan level. The proposal is a 5,695-square-foot, full-service restaurant on the easterly portion of the development. We did receive a special use permit from the Town Board on June 15. We also received approval from the Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA) for additional signage, as well as for front setback for the front vestibule portion of the building. When we met earlier with the Planning Board, we were asked to provide rear building detailing. We have added three stucco relief areas. There was concern expressed over cars potentially jumping the curb at the front entry. We have added landscaping on the perimeter of that area, with four lighted bollards, to avoid that.

Mr. Copey: This overall 1877 West Ridge Road project was reviewed in great detail with the Hess site plan. Town staff comments were shared and noted as minimal. It is important to note that the major, overall site improvements will be accomplished with the first phase of construction, whether that is Hess or Longhorn Steakhouse.

Mr. Gauthier: We had few issues other than the coordination of the two projects – which one would come first? In discussing this with the developer, it doesn't matter because he will do the development work in either case.

Mr. Ancello: When do you plan to begin construction of your building?

Ms. Nunn: That will have to be coordinated with 1877 West Ridge, LLC. They will be in charge with site development. They have to get to a certain point in the site development before we can get it. We hope that it will be very soon.

Mr. Selke: Clarify for me the landscaping along the West Ridge Road frontage.

Ms. Nunn: It is to be similar to what is on the Hess site so that there is consistency along West Ridge Road.

Mr. Selke: I have questions about the stone and the color stone samples

Ms. Nunn: It is a multi-colored, synthetic, cut stone. The colors always look worse on the board. They look very nice. This is an enhanced building for us.

Mr. Fisher: Is there a requirement for an as-built drawing on the storm water management facility?

## PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

JULY 21, 2010

Mr. Gauthier: Yes, before we accept it, there is an entire process we go through. We will provide guidelines and drawings will be provided to us before we sign plans. We will need a drawing and a spreadsheet to demonstrate that they built what was approved by the Board.

Mr. Fisher: Is the slope on this such that someone could walk out?

Mr. Gauthier: It is maintainable. I think that it is at least 3:1; I'm hoping that it may be 4:1; 3:1 is the minimum maintainable slope for equipment.

### **Motion by Mr. Marianetti , seconded by Ms. Sofia:**

WHEREAS, 1877 Ridge Road LLC, Angelo Ingrassia (the "Applicant") has submitted a proposal to the Town of Greece Planning Board (the "Planning Board") for approval of a site plan, as more fully described in the minutes of this public meeting (the "Proposal"), relative to property located 1877 – 1899 West Ridge Road (the "Premises"); and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board makes the following findings:

1. Upon review of the Proposal, the Planning Board determined that the Proposal is subject to the State Environmental Quality Review Act (New York State Environmental Conservation Law, Article 8) and its implementing regulations (6 NYCRR Part 617 *et seq.*, the "SEQRA Regulations") (collectively, "SEQRA"), and that the Proposal constitutes an Unlisted action under SEQRA.
2. The Planning Board has considered the Proposal at a public meeting (the "Meeting") in the Greece Town Hall, 1 Vince Tofany Boulevard, at which time all persons and organizations in interest were heard.
3. Documentary, testimonial, and other evidence were presented at the Meeting relative to the Proposal for the Planning Board's consideration.
4. The Planning Board carefully has considered an Environmental Assessment Form and supplementary information prepared by the Applicant and the Applicant's representatives, including but not limited to supplemental maps, drawings, descriptions, analyses, reports, and reviews (collectively, the "Environmental Analysis").
5. The Planning Board carefully has considered additional information and comments that resulted from telephone conversations, meetings, or written correspondence from or with the Applicant and the Applicant's representatives.
6. The Planning Board carefully has considered information, recommendations, and comments that resulted from telephone conversations, meetings, or written correspondence from or with various involved and interested agencies, including but not limited to the Monroe County Department of Planning and Development, the Monroe County Department of Environmental Services, the Town of Greece Environmental Board, and the Town's own staff.
7. The Planning Board carefully has considered information, recommendations, and comments that resulted from telephone conversations, meetings, or written correspondence from or with nearby property owners, and all other comments submitted to the Planning Board as of this date.
8. The Environmental Analysis examined the relevant issues associated with the Proposal.
9. The Planning Board has met the procedural and substantive requirements of SEQRA.



PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

JULY 21, 2010

10. The Planning Board carefully has considered each and every criterion for determining the potential significance of the Proposal upon the environment, as set forth in SEQRA.
11. The Planning Board carefully has considered (that is, has taken the required "hard look" at) the Proposal and the relevant environmental impacts, facts, and conclusions disclosed in the Environmental Analysis.
12. The Planning Board concurs with the information and conclusions contained in the Environmental Analysis.
13. The Planning Board has made a careful, independent review of the Proposal and the Planning Board's determination is rational and supported by substantial evidence, as set forth herein.
14. To the maximum extent practicable, potential adverse environmental effects revealed in the environmental review process will be minimized or avoided by the incorporation of mitigation measures that were identified as practicable.

NOW, THEREFORE, be it

RESOLVED that, pursuant to SEQRA, based on the aforementioned information, documentation, testimony, and findings, and after examining the relevant issues, the Planning Board's own initial concerns, and all relevant issues raised and recommendations offered by involved and interested agencies and the Town's own staff, the Planning Board determines that the Proposal will not have a significant adverse impact on the environment, which constitutes a negative declaration.

<b>VOTE:</b>	<b>Ancello</b>	<b>- yes</b>	<b>Burke</b>	<b>- yes</b>
	<b>Marianetti</b>	<b>- yes</b>	<b>Plouffe</b>	<b>- absent</b>
	<b>Selke</b>	<b>- yes</b>	<b>Sofia</b>	<b>- yes</b>
			<b>Fisher</b>	<b>- yes</b>

**MOTION CARRIED**  
**SEQRA DETERMINATION**  
**NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

---

**Mr. Marianetti then made the following motion, seconded by Mr. Sofia, to approve the Proposal, subject to the following conditions:**

1. The Applicant shall develop the Premises in conformity with all details of the Proposal as presented in the written descriptions and site development plans, as orally presented to the Planning Board, and as set forth herein. In the event of any conflict among the oral or written descriptions of the proposal, the site development plans of the proposal, or the requirements or restrictions of this resolution, the Applicant agrees that the Planning Board shall determine the resolution of such dispute.
2. No building permits shall be issued unless and until highway permits are issued.
3. The proposal comes as the second phase in the overall development of the Latona Crossings commercial site. The overall development of the Latona Crossings site was approved along with the first phase of development (Hess Gas Station) on November 5, 2009. Timing is such that it is uncertain which of the two phases will begin construction first. As offered and agreed by the Applicant, improvements associated

## PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

JULY 21, 2010

with the overall development of this site, including but not limited to access, internal driveways, utilities, storm water management facilities, lighting, and landscaping, shall be constructed as part of which ever project starts first. The extent to which certain overall improvements may be staged shall be subject to approval by the Fire Marshal, Commissioner of Public Works, Chief Engineer, and Planning Board Clerk. The Planning Board Clerk may at his discretion determine that the staging of certain overall improvements requires additional review and/or approval by the Planning Board.

4. Addresses for each building shall be added to the plan.
5. The landscaping on the Premises shall be maintained by the current owner of the Premises, and by any future owner. The owner of the Premises shall replace any dead plants with the same species or a similar species. The replacement plant shall be no smaller than the previous plant when it originally was installed. A note that indicates these requirements shall be added to the plan.
6. Prior to the issuance of a Final Certificate of Occupancy for the Premises, The Applicant shall provide certification verifying proper installation of landscape areas on the site in accordance with the landscape plan approved by the Planning Board, and in accordance with the Town's Landscape Guidelines for Development. Such certification shall be on the certification form provided in such guidelines and shall be completed by a [New York State Licensed Landscape Architect or Certified Nursery Professional]. A note that indicates these requirements shall be added to the plan.
7. All heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) equipment shall be screened from public view. If the HVAC equipment is or will be roof-mounted, the screening for such HVAC equipment shall be visually compatible with the proposed building(s), and shall be shown on the architectural elevations of the building(s). If the HVAC equipment is or will be ground-mounted, its location shall be shown on the site plan. Evidence that such HVAC equipment is or will be screened shall be submitted for review and approval by the [Planning Board as part of the site plan / Clerk of the Planning Board prior to affixing the Planning Board approval signature to the site plan].
8. The exterior appearance (that is, materials, colors, and architectural style) of the proposed building shall be the same on all sides of the proposed building. As offered and agreed by the Applicant, such materials and colors shall be stone and Exterior Insulation and Finishing System ("EIFS") (in the tan-brown color families), with brown trim. Elevations of the exterior appearance shall identify these colors and materials, shall show all sides of the proposed building, and shall be filed with the site plan.
9. Light spill shall be contained on the Premises. Outdoor light sources shall be aimed or shielded so that they are not visible when viewed from off the Premises, and so that light spill is cast only downward onto the Premises. Exempt from this requirement are low-wattage or low-voltage lights that are located near the principal entrance to a building, and low-wattage or low-voltage lights, not higher than 42 inches above grade, that define a walkway or other access to a building. A note that indicates this requirement shall be added to the plan.
10. The special use permit that was approved by the Town Board and the date on which such special use permit was approved shall be added to the plan.
11. Water mains and hydrants shall be installed and be in proper operating conditions prior to the commencement of any aboveground construction.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

JULY 21, 2010

12. The locations of the designated fire lanes shall be shown on the Site Plan.
13. Permanently mounted "No Parking – Fire Lane" signs shall be posted along the fire lanes at intervals of 50 feet or less. A note that indicates this requirement shall be added to the plan.
14. No building permits shall be issued unless and until the Applicant executes, and files in the Office of the Monroe County Clerk, an easement and agreement for maintenance of the proposed storm water management pond. Such agreement shall be subject to approval by the Planning Board's Attorney and the Commissioner of Public Works.
15. No final approval signature shall be placed on the plans unless and until the appropriate easement documents have been prepared and provided to the Town for review.
16. No building permits shall be issued unless and until a digital copy of the plans has been submitted. All sheets in the drawing set, with all necessary signatures, shall be provided in Tagged Image File (".TIF") format at a minimum resolution of 400 dpi.
17. Upon completion of construction of the storm water management pond, the Applicant shall provide certification that such pond was constructed as designed and approved. Such certification shall be provided in the form of an as-built topographic survey with pertinent utility structures shown, prepared by a New York State Licensed Land Surveyor. No final approval signatures shall be placed on the site plan unless and until the Applicant has submitted to the Town a financial guarantee (such as a letter of credit, certified check, or other acceptable instrument), in an amount approved by the Town's Commissioner of Public Works and the Town Attorney, that is sufficient to properly construct the proposed pond, and to provide the aforementioned certification. No release of such financial guarantee shall be made unless and until the improvements and certification are completed to the satisfaction of the Town's Commissioner of Public Works and the Town Attorney.
18. Subject to approval by the Town's Fire Marshal, Chief Engineer, and Commissioner of Public Works.
19. Wherever this resolution refers to a specific applicant, developer, operator, or property owner, it shall be construed to include any successors and assigns.
20. Wherever this resolution refers to a specific public official or agency, it shall be construed to include successors and assigns.
21. Wherever this resolution refers to a specific law, ordinance, code, rule, or regulation, it shall be construed to include any succeeding or superseding authority.

<b>VOTE:</b>	<b>Ancello</b>	<b>- yes</b>	<b>Burke</b>	<b>- yes</b>
	<b>Marianetti</b>	<b>- yes</b>	<b>Plouffe</b>	<b>- absent</b>
	<b>Selke</b>	<b>- yes</b>	<b>Sofia</b>	<b>- yes</b>
			<b>Fisher</b>	<b>- yes</b>

**MOTION CARRIED**  
**APPLICATION APPROVED**  
**WITH CONDITIONS**

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES  
JULY 21, 2010

**2. Applicant: 2390 West Ridge, LLC**

Location: 2390 West Ridge Road

Request: Site plan approval for a proposed two-story commercial building (6672+/- square feet first floor, 3081+/- square feet lower level; 9937+/- square feet total) and renovation of a former church for commercial use, with related parking, utilities, grading, and landscaping on approximately 1.03 acres

Zoning District: BR (Restricted Business)

Mon. Co. Tax No.: 074.14-2-22.2

**The following is a synopsis of the discussion pertaining to the above-referenced request:**

Kris Schultz, L.S., P.E., of Schultz Associates; Larry Fenity, R.A., Fenity Architects; and Patrick Basset, 2390 West Ridge, LLC, presented the application.

Mr. Schultz: We received approval last evening for signage and setback from the Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA). You just received the new landscaping plans, which include two additional planting beds in the front sidewalk area. We have met with Town staff and Gina DiBella, Chairperson of the Greece Historic Preservation Commission, to review the building architecture, as was requested at our last meeting with the Board.

Mr. Fenity: Thank you to the Board and Ms. DiBella for all their help. The new building is a simple rectangle with gabled ends. Most of the building activity takes place under the covered walkway. The two gabled ends extend out from the building six feet and the center piece extends out eight feet. The stone at the base will match as closely as possible to the Medina sandstone on the church. The brick above it will be in the same color range. The trim and Exterior Insulation and Finishing System ("EIFS") frame is in a creamy gray color. At this time we are looking at a brown-gray roofing material. The metal roof portions will be in copper. We have modified the rear elevations to add false windows and trim so that it is more appealing.

Mr. Copey: I'll refer to the July 7 meeting minutes for most of the comments. The updated landscaping plan will be shared for review. I'd like to refer to the letter from Saint John the Evangelist Church making specific requests including additional lighting. I want to express our department's thanks to the applicant for working with us to retain the old church.

Mr. Gauthier: We have only relatively minor comments.

Gina DiBella, Chairperson of the Town of Greece Historic Preservation Commission: Gina introduces commissioners with her: John Geisler and Linda Dawley.

The Historic Preservation Commission would like to thank Mr. Basset and his design team for listening to our concerns and incorporating some of our suggestions into the design of the new building.

After reviewing the newest set of plans for the new building and former church, I had the opportunity to meet with Virginia Searl, one of the principals from Bero Architecture. Bero is known for its work on historic properties across New York State.

**Suggestions/Comments on new building:**

- The new building is indeed sympathetic to the historic building, which is what you want to strive for when creating a new structure near a historic one.

## PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

JULY 21, 2010

- The roof pitches on the new building are good.
- The circular details in the two end gables are fine, but aren't necessary if they don't serve a function.
- The number of different materials being used on the exterior of the new building should be kept to two. The brick is okay; instead of EIFS in the center pavilion, keep it brick. Instead of using an imitation stone that doesn't really match the Medina sandstone, you could use a split-face concrete block in a sympathetic color. Or try a different color brick, different brick coursing pattern, corbelling, or change in pattern.
- On piers/columns of the center pavilion, keep the height of the variation of materials the same as on the gable ends – perhaps a water table height of split-face concrete or different color brick, with the remainder including up into the signage area the same brick as the rest of the building.
- The metal roof on the new building isn't necessary (it could be asphalt), but if you do use metal, use a color that complements or blends with the asphalt roof and doesn't stick out.

### **Comments/Suggestions for the church building:**

#### New Entry

- The roof of the new entry should be asphalt, like the rest of the building, NOT metal. Metal stands out and is not appropriate for the historic building.
- Materials for the new entry should be brick, in a color that will complement the stone or a light gray, similar to the limestone on the buttress caps or around the front door.
- The piers/columns on the new entry are too wide. Their proportion (width to height) is out of scale with the vertical elements of the façade. Their width should be closer to the width of the buttresses.
- The height of the piers should extend to the same height as the existing church roofline. You could change the pattern or brick color when it reaches the buttress caps for some variation.
- The flat surface of the gable end should extend only as far as the eaves of the existing church.
- Reduce the amount of glazing in the entry door to only the amount necessary to serve as a main door. (This will save money in construction and heating/cooling costs.) You might also consider reusing the stones you remove when you install the doorway in the columns of the new entry.

#### Windows

- Use divided-light, pointed, arched windows on the side elevations. If any windows will be covered from the inside and not used for illumination, but will still look like windows from the outside, be sure to paint the exposed drywall area black or a dark color.
- For former windows (like in the back of the church) that are covered over and will remain covered, paint the wood or covering a color that's closer to, but not

## PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

JULY 21, 2010

identical to, the stone. You want people to know there was once a window there, but you don't want it to pop out.

- Front windows – do not add metal awnings. They are inappropriate for the building. If you need to cut down on the sunlight, add a film to the glass (not orange or too dark).
- On the two plate glass windows, add two vertical dividers to give the windows a more vertical than horizontal feel. (You'll end up with three panes in each window.) Vertical is more appropriate for the age and Gothic-revival style of this building.
- Front door/window – do not make it a single light. Instead, give it the appearance that it was once a door, dividing the light into a pointed arch at the top, and into two vertical panes below where the doors once were, using a wider glazing for the frame.

### Signage

- We have some concern about the size and placement of the signs on the church building. A sign should not be placed on the front elevation that faces West Ridge Road. The sign on the new entry should be reduced in size. (Who handles sign approval?)

### Removal of chimney and other roof materials in back section

- Removal of the large square unidentifiable feature in the back section would be fine.
- If the back chimney is not functioning, remove the brick down to the stone and just cap off the stone.

### Belfry

- At the last Planning Board meeting we commented on the importance of the church building's belfry.
- It is the opinion of the Commission as well as Ms. Searl at Bero that the belfry is a character-defining feature of the building. Few of those features remain. For that reason, it should be retained and refurbished if possible or rebuilt if it cannot be restored.
- The Commission would like to request that the Planning Board, as a condition of its approval of this application, require that the belfry of the former church building be retained or rebuilt.

We thank you for giving us the opportunity to comment on these buildings and hope you will take them into consideration as you make your decisions tonight or in the future.

Linda Evans, Town of Greece Environmental Board: The Environmental Board felt that the landscape plans for this development were above average, but would like to encourage the developers to follow the recommendations of the Town of Greece Tree Council.

Mr. Sofia: Can we see what the developer's position is relative to Gina's comments?

Pat Basset, Owner/Developer: I was impressed with her comments and that she took the time to get expert recommendations. We need to see what we can incorporate.

## PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

JULY 21, 2010

Mr. Fisher: Previously, you had indicated that most of your focus would be on the new building. For the old church, it would be the new entryway, and work on the church would be dependent upon a tenant. You indicated that you would look at the belfry and if at all possible save it or replace it.

Mr. Basset: Our intention is to keep it right where it is. It is a bigger structure than you might think. It would be easier to repair it than to tear it down.

Mr. Fisher: I think that these elevations are a substantial improvement from the last meeting and closer to what you originally proposed.

Mr. Basset: You have been very helpful. This is a difficult project and structure to work with. There is passion here and we all want to see this get done.

Mr. Fisher: It is an important structure to the town. It may not reflect exactly, but will be a good complement to it.

Mr. Selke: In referring to the old church, Ms. DiBella referred to the belfry, windows, entrance way, and shutters.

Mr. Basset: No, Ms. DiBella was referring to awnings that we added to the front of the church. I'm not sure that they are going to work out anyway. It will be difficult to mount them in Medina sandstone. We need to get the Building Department from the Town to get into the building with us. We don't want to remove a front handicap access ramp, only to find out that the Town's Fire Marshal wants another access.

Mr. Selke: I'd like to see you get through the process this evening. However, Ms. DiBella has recommended some changes. How do we handle this?

Mr. Copey: Ms. DiBella provided a lot of information, many of them small details. I'd like some direction from the Board on any of the items that are not clearly covered as conditions of approval.

Mr. Basset: I'd like to see approval this evening. I need to get my tenants into the new building. Maybe leave the church out of the approval. If the Planning Board doesn't want the metal roof, it's out.

Mr. Fenity: In terms of the existing church, we would all love to see it restored. The fact is, the building has sat there in its present state and we haven't been able to do anything with it. Some of the changes being made are intended to give it retail appeal. It's a balancing act.

Mr. Sofia: The biggest item was the belfry if I understand correctly.

Ms. DiBella: The belfry and the roof.

Mr. Basset: Are you asking me to scrap the metal roof?

Mr. Copey: Is it fair to say that some of these items are a matter of taste as opposed to issues of historic preservation?

Mr. Fenity: You all saw my original elevations for this, which kept the new building more in keeping with the church. The problem with that was we could not find tenants for it. We have tried to compromise here.

Mr. Fisher: You ensure the stability of the structure by providing a commercial support for the buildings. You are putting money into this rather than just knocking it down. I would opt for compromise here. We need the ability to attract tenants. Mr. Basset has gone a long way with us on this project.

## PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

JULY 21, 2010

Mr. Sofia: I liked the metal roofs as a retail consumer. There are asphalt roofs all over West Ridge Road. You aren't changing the main roof, just the entrance.

Mr. Ancello: Mr. Basset is making a big investment. We need to give him a chance, so flexibility is important.

Ms. Burke: I like the metal roof. I say, let them keep it.

Mr. Selke: We have to be flexible and compromise here. There are small things that have been suggested that perhaps we can do in addition to the belfry.

John Geisler, Member of Greece Historic Preservation Commission: You need to keep the belfry and stone. I hope that you can remove the handicap access ramp in the front. The only portion to be copper is the canopy. If that has to be to attract tenants, that's okay.

Ms. DiBella: The comments I provided were not meant to recreate the building to make it historically correct. I feel a metal roof will look like it has been slapped on. It doesn't belong there and you don't want to copy the new building. The awnings in the front I definitely do not agree with, either. I don't think you want to call too much attention to the building. I am willing to discuss further.

Mr. Schultz: I started on this project many years ago and the plan was to take the church down. I told Mr. Basset that I didn't want to do that. We've worked with the Town on this. I just want to state that if he doesn't get a return on his money, this building will have to come down. If the metal roof gets a tenant, it keeps the church. I respect what Ms. DiBella is saying but we need to get some concessions.

### **Motion by Mr. Sofia, seconded by Mr. Selke:**

WHEREAS, 2390 West Ridge LLC, (the "Applicant") has submitted a proposal to the Town of Greece Planning Board (the "Planning Board") for approval of a site plan, as more fully described in the minutes of this public meeting (the "Proposal"), relative to property located 2390 West Ridge Road (the "Premises"); and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board makes the following findings:

1. Upon review of the Proposal, the Planning Board determined that the Proposal is subject to the State Environmental Quality Review Act (New York State Environmental Conservation Law, Article 8) and its implementing regulations (6 NYCRR Part 617 *et seq.*, the "SEQRA Regulations") (collectively, "SEQRA"), and that the Proposal constitutes an Unlisted action under SEQRA.
2. The Planning Board has considered the Proposal at a public meeting (the "Meeting") in the Greece Town Hall, 1 Vince Tofany Boulevard, at which time all persons and organizations in interest were heard.
3. Documentary, testimonial, and other evidence were presented at the Meeting relative to the Proposal for the Planning Board's consideration.
4. The Planning Board carefully has considered an Environmental Assessment Form and supplementary information prepared by the Applicant and the Applicant's representatives, including but not limited to supplemental maps, drawings, descriptions, analyses, reports, and reviews (collectively, the "Environmental Analysis").
5. The Planning Board carefully has considered additional information and comments that resulted from telephone conversations, meetings, or written correspondence from or with the Applicant and the Applicant's representatives.



## PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

JULY 21, 2010

6. The Planning Board carefully has considered information, recommendations, and comments that resulted from telephone conversations, meetings, or written correspondence from or with various involved and interested agencies, including but not limited to the Monroe County Department of Planning and Development, the Monroe County Department of Environmental Services, the Town of Greece Environmental Board, and the Town's own staff.
7. The Planning Board carefully has considered information, recommendations, and comments that resulted from telephone conversations, meetings, or written correspondence from or with nearby property owners, and all other comments submitted to the Planning Board as of this date.
8. The Environmental Analysis examined the relevant issues associated with the Proposal.
9. The Planning Board has met the procedural and substantive requirements of SEQRA.
10. The Planning Board carefully has considered each and every criterion for determining the potential significance of the Proposal upon the environment, as set forth in SEQRA.
11. The Planning Board carefully has considered (that is, has taken the required "hard look" at) the Proposal and the relevant environmental impacts, facts, and conclusions disclosed in the Environmental Analysis.
12. The Planning Board concurs with the information and conclusions contained in the Environmental Analysis.
13. The Planning Board has made a careful, independent review of the Proposal and the Planning Board's determination is rational and supported by substantial evidence, as set forth herein.
14. To the maximum extent practicable, potential adverse environmental effects revealed in the environmental review process will be minimized or avoided by the incorporation of mitigation measures that were identified as practicable.

NOW, THEREFORE, be it

RESOLVED that, pursuant to SEQRA, based on the aforementioned information, documentation, testimony, and findings, and after examining the relevant issues, the Planning Board's own initial concerns, and all relevant issues raised and recommendations offered by involved and interested agencies and the Town's own staff, the Planning Board determines that the Proposal will not have a significant adverse impact on the environment, which constitutes a negative declaration.

<b>VOTE:</b>	<b>Ancello</b>	<b>- yes</b>	<b>Burke</b>	<b>- yes</b>
	<b>Marianetti</b>	<b>- yes</b>	<b>Plouffe</b>	<b>- absent</b>
	<b>Selke</b>	<b>- yes</b>	<b>Sofia</b>	<b>- yes</b>
			<b>Fisher</b>	<b>- yes</b>

**MOTION CARRIED**  
**SEQRA DETERMINATION**  
**NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

---

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

JULY 21, 2010

**Motion by Mr. Sofia, seconded by Mr. Selke, to approve the application with the following conditions:**

1. The Applicant shall develop the Premises in conformity with all details of the Proposal as presented in the written descriptions and site development plans, as orally presented to the Planning Board, and as set forth herein. In the event of any conflict among the oral or written descriptions of the proposal, the site development plans of the proposal, or the requirements or restrictions of this resolution, the Applicant agrees that the Planning Board shall determine the resolution of such dispute.
2. No building permits shall be issued unless and until highway permits are issued.
3. Addresses for each building shall be added to the plan.
4. The plan shall show the dimensions and purpose of the easements on the Premises, to whom the easements are granted, and the Libers and Pages at which they are filed or recorded in the Office of the Monroe County Clerk.
5. The landscaping on the Premises shall be maintained by the current owner of the Premises, and by any future owner. The owner of the Premises shall replace any dead plants with the same species or a similar species. The replacement plant shall be no smaller than the previous plant when it originally was installed. A note that indicates these requirements shall be added to the plan.
6. Prior to the issuance of a Final Certificate of Occupancy for the Premises, The Applicant shall provide certification verifying proper installation of landscape areas on the site in accordance with the landscape plan approved by the Planning Board, and in accordance with the Town's Landscape Guidelines for Development. Such certification shall be on the certification form provided in such guidelines and shall be completed by a [New York State Licensed Landscape Architect or Certified Nursery Professional]. A note that indicates these requirements shall be added to the plan.
7. No dumpster enclosure is currently proposed. As offered and agreed by the Applicant, refuse is to be stored inside the building, a note that indicates this shall be added to the plan.
8. All heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) equipment shall be screened from public view. If the HVAC equipment is or will be roof-mounted, the screening for such HVAC equipment shall be visually compatible with the proposed building(s), and shall be shown on the architectural elevations of the building(s). If the HVAC equipment is or will be ground-mounted, its location shall be shown on the site plan. Evidence that such HVAC equipment is or will be screened shall be submitted for review and approval by the Clerk of the Planning Board prior to affixing the Planning Board approval signature to the site plan.
9. The exterior appearance (that is, materials, colors, and architectural style) of the existing historic church shall remain essentially as it currently exists, with the exception of relocating the building entrance as shown in architectural elevations presented this evening. The Applicant has proposed to re-roof the church, replace windows in keeping with the architectural style of the church, retain and stabilize the existing historic belfry to the extent deemed reasonable by the Building Inspector, and construct a new handicapped access ramp with a stone or masonry wall to help the ramp blend in with the existing building. Elevations of the exterior appearance of the historic church shall identify proposed improvements, shall show all sides of the historic church, and shall be filed with the site plan.
10. The architecture of the proposed new structure will compliment but not duplicate the historic church. The exterior appearance (that is, materials, colors, and architectural

## PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

JULY 21, 2010

style) of the proposed building shall be generally consistent on all sides of the proposed building. As offered and agreed by the Applicant, such materials and colors shall be stone (in a color that would resemble the stone used to build the historic church) and brick (in the reddish-brown color family), and asphalt roof (in the brown color family). Elevations of the exterior appearance shall identify these colors and materials, shall show all sides of the proposed building, and shall be filed with the site plan.

11. Details or catalogue cuts of the proposed light fixtures and standards shall be added to the plan.
12. In a letter dated December 10, 2008 from Bob Skrypek and Ann D'Aurelio, Business Manager for the Church of Saint John the Evangelist, the Church has requested that the Planning Board permit lighting from the proposal to spill onto the church parking area located immediately north of the site. The proposal must remain compliant with §211-32 of the Town of Greece Code in that no spot lighting or other high-intensity lighting may be spilled onto adjacent property, and that light sources themselves (bulbs) must be shielded so that they are not visible from adjoining property. The Planning Board's general expectation is that site lighting levels will diminish to around zero (0) foot-candles at the perimeter of a proposal in order to minimize impacts to surrounding properties and manage overall light levels in a given area. In this case, however, where there exists a deficiency of site lighting between properties, and because safety concerns have been addressed to the Board, the proposed site lighting is hereby permitted to spill onto the adjoining church parking lot to the degree that the developer is willing to allow it, and in compliance with §211-32 of the Town of Greece Code. It shall not be construed that the Planning Board is requiring additional lighting for the proposal.
13. The proposed development has limited snow storage capacity. The Applicant and future owners of the property shall be responsible for removing excess snow from the site promptly in order to maintain adequate site distances, provide adequate parking, and maintain clear drive lanes on site. A note indicating this requirement shall be added to the plans.
14. The area variances that were granted Board of Zoning Appeals and the date on which such area variances were granted shall be added to the plan.
15. No building permits shall be issued unless and until a digital copy of the plans has been submitted. All sheets in the drawing set, with all necessary signatures, shall be provided in Tagged Image File (".TIF") format at a minimum resolution of 400 dpi.
16. The locations of all exterior doors shall be shown on the plan. All exterior doors shall be connected by a sidewalk to an acceptable fire safety zone.
17. The locations of the designated fire lanes shall be shown on the Site Plan.
18. Permanently mounted "No Parking – Fire Lane" signs shall be posted along the fire lanes at intervals of 50 feet or less. A note that indicates this requirement shall be added to the plan.
19. No building permits shall be issued unless and until the Applicant executes an easement and agreement for maintenance of the proposed storm water management facility. Such agreement shall be subject to approval by the Planning Board's Attorney and the Commissioner of Public Works.
20. No final approval signature shall be placed on the plans unless and until the appropriate easement documents have been prepared and provided to the Town for review.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

JULY 21, 2010

21. No building permits shall be issued for any of the lots in this subdivision unless and until the appropriate easement documents, including all necessary map references, have been filed in the Office of the Monroe County Clerk. The Liber and Page of easement filing shall be referenced on final as-built record drawings provided to the Town.
22. Upon completion of construction of the storm water management facility, the Applicant shall provide certification that such facility was constructed as designed and approved. Such certification shall be provided in the form of an as-built drawing prepared by an appropriately licensed design professional. No final approval signatures shall be placed on the site plan unless and until the Applicant has submitted to the Town a financial guarantee (such as a letter of credit, certified check, or other acceptable instrument), in an amount approved by the Town's Commissioner of Public Works and the Town Attorney, that is sufficient to properly construct the proposed facility and to provide the aforementioned certification. No release of such financial guarantee shall be made unless and until the improvements and certification are completed to the satisfaction of the Town's Commissioner of Public Works and the Town Attorney.
23. Subject to approval by the Town's Fire Marshal, Chief Engineer, and Commissioner of Public Works.
24. Wherever this resolution refers to a specific applicant, developer, operator, or property owner, it shall be construed to include any successors and assigns.
25. Wherever this resolution refers to a specific public official or agency, it shall be construed to include successors and assigns.
26. Wherever this resolution refers to a specific law, ordinance, code, rule, or regulation, it shall be construed to include any succeeding or superseding authority.
27. As agreed to by the Applicant, the Applicant shall work with Town's staff to incorporate recommendations received this evening from the Town's Historic Preservation Commission regarding site architecture without creating excessive cost or jeopardizing the commercial potential for the site.

<b>VOTE:</b>	<b>Ancello</b>	<b>- yes</b>	<b>Burke</b>	<b>- yes</b>
	<b>Marianetti</b>	<b>- yes</b>	<b>Plouffe</b>	<b>- absent</b>
	<b>Selke</b>	<b>- yes</b>	<b>Sofia</b>	<b>- yes</b>
			<b>Fisher</b>	<b>- yes</b>

**MOTION CARRIED**  
**APPLICATION APPROVED**  
**WITH CONDITIONS**

---

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES  
JULY 21, 2010

**New Business**

**1. Applicant: 4320 West Ridge, LLC**

Location: Generally north of and including 4232 – 4350 West Ridge Road

Request: Site plan approval for Phase I of the Hampton Ridge Center commercial development, consisting of a proposed automotive sales and leasing dealership (28,924+/- square feet) with related parking, utilities, grading, and landscaping on approximately 7.2 acres, plus additional acreage for storm water management

Zoning: BG (General Business)

Mon. Co. Tax No.: 073.01-1-2.1, -3, -4, -5, -6, -7; 073.01-2-63, -64.111, -64.12, -64.2, -68

**The following is a synopsis of the discussion pertaining to the above-referenced request:**

Andrew Hart RLA, ASLA, Landscape Architect of Bergmann Associates, presented the application.

Mr. Hart: We have with us tonight many members of the design team and representatives of Auction Direct, a used vehicle dealership. Auction Direct will be the first phase of Hampton Ridge Center. The property was rezoned by the Town Board last month to General Business (BG). Auction Direct will be the first site plan application for Hampton Ridge Center. Auction Direct will be a 28,924-square-foot, one-story building located on the western edge of the site. Full build-out will include to the north some "big box" tenants, restaurants along West Ridge Road, and to the east we show one building containing many small shops. As part of this project, we are maintaining the existing cobblestone house on the west edge of the parcel. The main entrance is from West Ridge Road, with a connector road to the east edge at Kohl's department store. Right now, all we are proposing is a T-intersection. The parking provided for Auction Direct meets the requirements of the Town's zoning ordinance. We are proposing a 409-space display lot to the south of the building toward West Ridge Road. It will be fenced with decorative fencing and landscaping. It will be accessed through a gate, only with assistance from an Auction Direct employee. There will be parking in the rear building for approximately 91 vehicles for staging and being readied for sale. Another lot just east of the entrance will be used for employee and visitor parking. Lighting for Auction Direction is 400-watt, metal halide, downcast lighting. It will be mounted on 27.5-foot-high poles, with shoebox-style lighting fixtures. The same fixture currently is used at Kohl's. Landscaping will be provided at the vehicle inventory lot, with pine and spruce trees along the west property line, and shade trees around the site. We will retain the majority of the 100-foot-wide eastern buffer of natural vegetation. When we get to the pond, the buffer gets narrower to about 50 feet. Utilities for the site are available. Sanitary sewer will be extended from the north at Daffodil Trail and extend south into the site for Auction Direction. At full build-out, the sanitary sewer will be dedicated to the Town. Storm water is handled by a large pond to the north of the site and will be constructed as part of Phase 1. It is sized to handle more than needed. The water service will be private with an existing back-flow device. As other development occurs and water capacity is needed we will upgrade. A traffic analysis has been submitted. New trips generated by Auction Direct are 79 during the Friday p.m. peak hour, and 86 at the Saturday mid-day peak hour. A traffic signal is not warranted at this time. The building is pre-manufactured steel, clad with a combination of Exterior Insulation and Finishing System ("EIFS") and stainless steel panels. The roof will be standing metal seamed roof that pitches from west

## PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

JULY 21, 2010

to east. There will be a parapet that will hide the roof when approaching the building. The HVAC units will be on the roof of the building. We are proposing 15 services bays and 5 doll-up bays in 18,000 square feet of service area. The remainder of the building is for administration and sales force. We are projecting 70 employees, and have provided parking.

Mr. Copey: As you know, the site consists of 67 acres located to the west of the Kohl's department store site. It has been rezoned to BG (General Business). The State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA) review was a coordinated review and has been completed. We do not yet have comments from the Monroe County Development Review Committee (MCDRC). Some comments are slow in coming because we are looking at the entire site, although the first phase is only Auction Direct. The Greece Environmental Board (GEB) comments are: the Town's Tree Council should walk the site; the Environmental Board is concerned about "sprawl"; suggest updating the Town's Master Plan; and because part of the site was formerly a landfill, a complete soil analysis should be done. The Fire Marshal has met with Mr. Hart and an address scheme has been laid out. The Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA) has before them a request for a special use permit and has asked for a recommendation from the Planning Board. Just today, we received comments from the Town's Traffic Advisory Committee (TAC). They understand that the developer is working with both the State and County Departments of Transportation, so their focus was on the internal traffic circulation. They have commented that the main entrance is undersized for full build-out. The entrance should be increased to the proposed width and number of lanes in the concept plans of November 2009. Although the proposed four-way intersection may work better than the one at Elmridge Plaza, they still have concerns. At full build-out, the entrance road will have two lanes in both directions, as shown on the concept, and will have a median. The applicant's examples of four-way intersections that work do not have more than one lane and have less volume. Under high volume conditions, these intersections also do not function as well. Options to consider: a roundabout (which you have seen on previous plans); or offset the east/west roads so that they do not create a four-way intersection. The TAC further recommended that the entrance road for Phase 2 be changed to the western entrance along the common property line with Vanderstyne Toyota. This also eliminates concerns with cross access. If the developer is no longer proposing the western driveway, the modifications for the four-way intersection and entrance road are recommended. Also, internal pedestrian traffic must be addressed. The Monroe County Water Authority reviewed and had no issues. We have a letter from The DiMarco Group stating their intention to preserve the existing cobblestone structure. They plan to remove the addition that was put on to it several years ago, and agreed to stabilize the structure by re-pointing the masonry walls and repairing the roof. They plan to have minimal disturbance to the house and existing grades will be preserved around the foundation of the building. This places the building in a holding pattern, which is much better than previously thought. We received a letter from Albert Mercury, Esq. of Phillips Lytle, representing Pat Basset, who is the adjoining property owner. The letter expresses concern that the proposed easement for the future public sanitary sewer falls short of the property and does not adjoin The DiMarco Group's west property line. We have a response to that letter from Thomas Greiner, Esq. of Nixon Peabody stating that they plan to make the extension a private lateral at this time.

Mr. Gauthier: Comments were provided on July 19<sup>th</sup> and there has not been an opportunity for the applicant to respond. The comments cover a significant amount of technical detail on drainage, grading and erosion, Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), utilities, and sanitary sewers. We also have noted that additional comments will come. At this time, we cannot recommend approval.

## PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

JULY 21, 2010

Gina DiBella, Chairperson of the Greece Historic Preservation Commission: The Historic Preservation Commission has been keeping a watchful eye on this property for several years now. On a very small portion of this development site sits a structure of extreme importance to the Town of Greece, a modest cobblestone building, located at 4350 West Ridge Road.

While the particular site plans you are reviewing tonight do not directly involve the cobblestone house, the Commission thought this would be a good time to bring it to your attention.

The Commission was very glad to learn last month that The DiMarco Group intends to retain and preserve the original structure, with the hope of leasing it if an appropriate tenant is found. We commend them for their willingness to preserve this piece of Greece's architectural history.

While the cobblestone house is small in stature, it is extremely significant both architecturally and historically. Architecturally, it is one of only four remaining cobblestone buildings in the Town of Greece. As detailed in the survey I mentioned earlier, this early 19<sup>th</sup> century Federal-style cobblestone farmhouse, built sometime between 1830 and 1852, "retains a high degree of integrity of design, materials, and craftsmanship." (Photos of the structures taking over a series of years are shared with the Board). Historically, it serves as a visual reminder of the agricultural heritage of Greece.

Cobblestone buildings are very unique to Western New York. In fact, 90 percent of all cobblestone buildings in North America can be found within a 75-mile radius of Rochester. During the period of cobblestone construction (1825-1865) it is estimated that about 1000 to 1200 cobblestone structures were built in the United States and Canada. Only four remain in Greece.

In 2004, the New York State Historic Preservation Office determined that the building was eligible for listing in the State and National Registers of Historic Places. In the fall of 2007, the Historic Preservation Commission facilitated a meeting and site visit with John DiMarco II, developer of Hampton Ridge Center; Robert Englert, historic preservation analyst from the New York State Historic Preservation Office (the "SHPO"); and Cynthia Howk, architectural research coordinator for the Landmark Society of Western New York. During the site visit, the historical and architectural value of the building was discussed as well as options for reuse and the possibility of adding an architecturally sensitive addition.

If the property were to become listed on the National Register, the owner could be eligible for federal tax credits (20%) on any work done to the building. I spoke with Mr. Englert recently about this property, and he wanted me to share with the developer that the listing process should be relatively easy, with little or no cost involved. The Commission would like to add that we would be more than willing to assist with the process.

As work begins on Phase I of the Hampton Ridge project, the Commission has the following suggestions and questions:

- The Commission was glad to see that the historic building will be surrounded by orange construction fence, during other phases of construction. We also ask that you keep construction traffic and equipment as far away as possible from the historic building. The constant vibration from large equipment coming, going and working could cause damage to the existing building.
- When do you expect to remove the 1950s addition from the cobblestone building? When you do, Mr. Englert at the SHPO suggests that you ensure that the remaining structure is weather-tight.

## PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

JULY 21, 2010

- Regarding the existing shutters, the last time I drove by, one was sitting on the front porch, one was missing from the front; the others seemed intact. Mr. Englert encourages you to retain these shutters. If upon examination they seem to be in such a condition that cannot be repaired, and you need to remove them during the construction, he recommends that you at least take them off, reference them to the windows they correspond to, and store them in a safe place so that they can either be refurbished or used as models to recreate new ones.
- Mr. Englert was also concerned about the window sashes and that you do what you can to preserve them.
- The Commission suggests that members the Planning Board make a site visit to the cobblestone house so they can become familiar with the historic building when the time comes for work to be done to it. We would be glad to take you through and point out important architectural features.

Again, the Commission commends The DiMarco Group for its willingness to retain this building. We believe you have a unique building that will enhance your new development. In working on the designs for the newer buildings, you might consider incorporating features of the older building into the newer buildings – not necessarily siding the buildings with cobblestone, but instead using some type of masonry materials, similar colors, features like quoin work on the corners, and similar rooflines.

Mr. Fisher: I agree. I think that it would be helpful for members of the Board to see firsthand what the building is and its relationship to the site. Perhaps Mr. Copey can arrange that visit. We express our appreciation to Mr. DiMarco for putting time and money into supporting this structure.

Mark Moretti, Esq., Phillips Lytle, LLP: I'm here representing Pat Basset. We do have a response to the letter from Mr. Greiner, which was referred to earlier, and a number of concerns remain. However, it appears that there are a number of issues that the Planning Board still is considering with respect to this development. We think, to the extent that the Planning Board is going to hold open the public hearing, we would prefer to try to deal directly with the applicant in the interim rather than make a presentation this evening.

Mr. Fisher: That sounds like a good approach and one that we would prefer as well.

Mr. Sofia: I think that the TAC comments have merit. Four-way intersections are an accident hazard and I think that we need to look at another way.

Mr. Selke: In what condition will Phase 2 be left when you develop Phase 1? Trees, grass?

Mr. Hart: We will do some mass grading of the site, bring in fill. After that is completed, we would seed the area until further development. We would have to remove some existing vegetation to do the earth work.

Mr. Selke: The pond in the rear – is that to be open or will it be fenced?

Mr. Hart: We are not proposing a fence. The slopes to the pond meet the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) requirements. The depth of the pond at a water event is 12 feet; normal depth is 6 feet.

Mr. Selke: When you remove the addition on the cobblestone house, how many feet will be left?

Mr. Hart: Roughly 800 square feet.

Mr. Selke: You certainly have an issue with that four-way intersection, as this site is going to have a lot of traffic.



## PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

JULY 21, 2010

Mr. Hart: We'll take the comments into consideration. We will also have the architect present at the next meeting to share materials.

Mr. Fisher: I had an opportunity to visit the site; and it is my opinion that we need to continue that 100-foot-wide buffer between the proposed commercial and the existing residential. It is not just the visibility of the storm water pond, but the visibility of the rest of the site as well. It is also important that the slopes of the storm water pond be gentle enough that someone could walk out of the pond because of the pond's proximity to residences. This is a big site. There are huge mounds out front requiring a lot a movement of material as well as topsoil stripped off. However it will be handled, we have to minimize the impact to those living in the area.

Mr. Selke: Do you plan to fence off the residential area?

Mr. DiMarco: We don't plan to do that. Sometimes the fence parts disappear. We don't want a maintenance headache.

Mr. Fisher: I hope that we can maintain the natural buffer. I mentioned taking the opportunity to look at the cobblestone house. We want to encourage the use of the cobblestone house but not have the use be detrimental to it. How will the traffic layout affect the commercial viability of the house? Again, I encourage the applicant to work with the Town's Engineering Division to resolve any issues.

Mr. Sofia: What is the proposed width of the buffer? It seems to vary. You have more buffering where there is nothing, then you go to a 50-foot-wide buffer at the apartments, then virtually no buffering near the single-family houses.

Mr. DiMarco: It doesn't show it on our phase map, but this area is where the apartment complex is located. This other area is undeveloped.

Mr. Sofia: I understand better now.

Mr. Copey: Is the westerly access still in the cards?

Mr. Hart: We are not proposing one at this time. We are still working that out. With Phase 1, we are not showing it, but it is still coordinated. We've gone to great lengths in the traffic study on locations of the intersections. We have not moved any since we last discussed.

Mr. Copey: I think that it makes sense to show it on the drawing even if it is eliminated in the future. It relates to what you were saying about the cobblestone house and TAC comments. When I look at the grading sheets, Phase 1 looks like the entire site is to be cleared and rough graded.

Mr. DiMarco: We will be doing as little clearing and grading as necessary for the utilities and Auction Direct. I don't believe that it is our desire to grade the entire site but we are looking at the design of the entire site. It is a balancing act. I don't want to hydroseed 70 acres.

Mr. Gauthier: When we get into resolving a lot of the engineering comments, they get simpler if the area of disturbance is less. I am hopeful that we can zero in on this as we move forward. It will help the process move along.

Mr. DiMarco: It is not economically feasible to do all the site grading at one time. However, you have to study it in total. We want to give you what it looks like in total.

Tom Greiner, Esq., Nixon Peabody, LLP: How is the Town going to handle SEQRA on this?

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

JULY 21, 2010

Mr. Fisher: The SEQRA environmental review process was addressed with the rezoning. As long as everything remains consistent with what was analyzed in the Environmental Impact Statement, there should be no need for further review under SEQRA.

Mr. Copey: That is correct. The Planning Board wouldn't have to do anything with SEQRA unless there was a substantial change to the project.

Mr. Moretti: We also would like to reserve our right to take a look at that as well.

Mr. Copey: The Board of Zoning Appeals is looking for a recommendation on this from the Planning Board, but I don't think that the Board has all the information that it needs.

Mr. Fisher: Perhaps after our next meeting we will be in a position to make a recommendation. Right now, there are more questions than answers.

**Motion by Ms. Burke , seconded by Mr. Ancello, to continue the application to the August 18, 2010, meeting.**

<b>VOTE:</b>	<b>Ancello</b>	<b>- yes</b>	<b>Burke</b>	<b>- yes</b>
	<b>Marianetti</b>	<b>- yes</b>	<b>Plouffe</b>	<b>- absent</b>
	<b>Selke</b>	<b>- yes</b>	<b>Sofia</b>	<b>- yes</b>
			<b>Fisher</b>	<b>- yes</b>

**MOTION CARRIED  
APPLICATION CONTINUED TO  
AUGUST 18, 2010 MEETING**

---

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES  
JULY 21, 2010

**ADJOURNMENT:** 9:15 p.m.

**APPROVAL OF PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES**

The Planning Board of the Town of Greece, in the County of Monroe and State of New York,  
rendered the above decisions.

**Signed:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Chairman**

**Date:** \_\_\_\_\_